REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-15 are pending and stand rejected.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-15 are amended and new claims 16-23 are added. Therefore, claims 1-23 are now presented for consideration.

No new matter is presented by the claim amendments and new claims, accordingly, approval and entry of same are proper and are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

In the Action at page 2, item 2, the specification is objected to because of informalities therein.

Although the Applicants have adopted a number of the amendments to the specification suggested by the Examiner, it is believed that other amendments to the specification are not necessary for a full understanding of the disclosure and are not required.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY PEGG

In the Action at pages 2-6, item 4, claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pegg (U.S. Patent No. 5,163,097)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a device for checking user identification and recites "a matching unit which checks if the check value matches a user-entered value that is entered by a user in response to said at least one randomly generated number being presented to the user."

Pegg Reference

Pegg is directed to a method and apparatus for providing "secure access to a limited access system" (see Pegg column 2, lines 35-36) which prevents an onlooker from seeing and stealing a password, a PIN, etc. More particularly, Pegg discloses "maintaining a plurality of user selectable ciphering algorithms that are accessible by an authorization means, such as an authorization center; selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of user selectable ciphering

9

algorithms as an access ciphering method." (See Pegg column 2, lines 38-44.) That is, Pegg provides a plurality of algorithms, and lets a user select one of these algorithms. Further, the user calculates a non-machine generated access code, based on at least one dynamic variable (i.e., at least one dynamic key, such as Dow Jones Industrial Average), one or more fixed variables (i.e., one or more fixed keys, such as a PIN) and the selected ciphering algorithm, to enter the non-machine generated access code. (See Pegg column 2, lines 44-49.) The authorization center compares the user-entered access code with a code calculated at the authorization center. (See Pegg column 5, lines 41-51.)

Contrary to the Pegg apparatus, the present invention as recited in claim 1 employs "a user-entered value that is entered by a user in response to ... at least one randomly generated number being presented to the user." Thus, in response to at least one randomly generated number being presented, the user enters the user-entered value. Pegg does not disclose or suggest the use of "at least one randomly generated number" and, furthermore, the use of "at least one randomly generated number being presented to the user."

It is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the above noted reasons and is allowable.

Claims 6 and 11

It is submitted that claims 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least reasons similar to those of claim 1, and are allowable.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15, which depend from claims 1, 6 and 11 are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as those of claims 1, 6 and 11, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

Claims 4, 9 and 14, having similar recitations therein, include further patentable distinctions beyond those of claims 1, 6 and 11, respectively. Claim 4, as an example, includes the recitation of "a random-number generating unit which generates said at least one randomly generated number." Thus, the at least one randomly generated number is generated by the invention recited in claim 4 and the invention of claim 4 does not have to be on line with, for example, an authorization center. However, the Pegg apparatus needs to obtain the dynamic variables from an external source (i.e., the dynamic variable, for example, the Dow Jones Industrial Average, cannot be generated internally) and, thus, must be on line with the

authorization center (See Pegg at column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 5 and FIG. 3 at numerical reference 112.) Further, the Pegg apparatus communicating with the authorization center may fail to authenticate the user if a trouble with a communication line prevents the Pegg apparatus from obtaining the dynamic variables. Further, a level of security provided by the invention recited in claim 4 is higher than that of Pegg apparatus, because the Pegg apparatus requires external communication.

Accordingly, claim 4 is submitted to include further patentable distinctions beyond those of claim 1 and to be allowable for the further reasons noted above.

It is submitted that claims 9 and 14 also include further patentable distinctions similar to those of claim 4 and are allowable for reasons similar to those of the further reasons related to claim 4 as noted above.

NEW CLAIMS 16-23

Claims 16-23 are provided to afford a varying scope of protection.

Claims 16-18, having similar recitations therein, include similar further patentable distinctions beyond those of claims 1, 6 and 11, respectively. Claim 16, as an example, includes the recitation of "when the user enters a wrong user-entered value, the user is allowed to enter a new user-entered value in response to at least one new randomly generated number being presented to the user." Contrary to the present invention recited in claim 16, in the Pegg apparatus, the user must enter the same non-machine generated access code while the dynamic variables remain unchanged (e.g., while the Dow Jones Industrial Index remains unchanged, which creates a security breach).

Accordingly, claim 16 is submitted to include further patentable distinctions beyond those of claim 1 and to be allowable for the further reasons noted above.

It is submitted that claims 17 and 18 also include further patentable distinctions similar to those of claim 16 and are allowable for reasons similar to the further reasons related to claim 16 as noted above.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _10/30/03_   By: _Eric Berkowitz_

Eric Berkowitz
Registration No. 44,030

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501